

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended. The amendments introduce no new matter. Claims 4 and 13 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. A Terminal Disclaimer is attached. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Arani in the February 27, 2006 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1 and 10 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

The Office Action, in paragraph 3, rejects claim 10 on the ground of non-statutory double patenting over claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,250 to Lunt et al. The attached Terminal Disclaimer is filed to obviate the rejection.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 on the ground of non-statutory double patenting are respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 4, rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,684 B1 to Stefik et al. (hereinafter "Stefik"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Stefik teaches a trusted rendering device for minimizing the risk of unauthorized copying of rendered digital works (col. 4, lines 52-53). Stefik specifically teaches that the system allows the owner of a digital work to attach usage rights to the work, the usage rights for the work defining how it may be used and/or distributed, and that the digital works and their usage rights are stored in a secure repository (col. 5, lines 39-42). As such, in the system described in Stefik usage rights are stored with the digital work by the owner of the digital

work for later access and reproduction by the disclosed system. The Office Action alleges that step 1705 shown in Fig. 17 of Stefik can be considered to teach a featured determining forgery protection requirements for the document. This analysis is incorrect. Step 1705 in Fig. 17 discloses that the print server collects watermark information to create a new watermark font that encodes watermark data. There is nothing in step 1705 of Fig. 17 or the accompanying description, or in any of the other text associated with any other feature that is alleged by the Office Action to show the recited claim feature that can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested any determining step as recited in at least independent claims 1 and 10. In Stefik, any forgery protection requirements are determined by the owner and/or user and associated with the document when the document is created and/or stored.

The subject matter of the pending claims indicates a system and method that determines forgery protection requirements for a document to be printed using a print management system and a computerized policy stored on a computer device to collect information about the document and to use the collected information in determining forgery protection requirements.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, a document forgery protection printing method, comprising determining forgery protection requirements for the document to be printed using a print management system and a computerized policy stored on a computer device to collect information about the document and to use the collected information in determining forgery protection requirements; and determining a protection level to be applied to the document based on the determined forgery protection requirements. Claim 10 recites, among other features, at least one server having a print management system and storing a policy that determines forgery protection requirements and a forgery protection level for the document; wherein the policy collects information about the document and determines the protection

level for the document based on the information collected. There is nothing in Stefik that can reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, any determining of forgery protection requirements and/or a protection level to be applied to a document based on information collected about the document.


Applicants' representative presented the above arguments to Examiner Arani during the February 27 personal interview. The Examiner agreed that the arguments that Applicants' representative presented clarified features that distinguish the subject matter of the pending claims over Stefik. Specifically, it was agreed that the Stefik system already has the determined protection level while the subject matter of the pending claims determines the protection level requirements by collecting information from the subject document. The Examiner indicated that Applicants' representative's arguments appear to overcome the prior art rejections of the Office Action.

For at least the above reasons, Stefik cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features positively recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Further, claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11, 12 and 14-17 are also neither taught, nor would they have been suggested, by Stefik for at least the respective dependence of these claims directly or indirectly on independent claims 1 and 10, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Daniel A. Tanner, III  
Registration No. 54,734

JAO:DAT/dxc

Attachment:  
Terminal Disclaimer

Date: March 1, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--